REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-73 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 20, 39 and 40 are amended to more clearly distinguish over the applied references, and claim 2 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter. Claims 68-73 are added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully appreciates that the Office Action indicates that claims 8, 9, 27, 28, 44-46, 66 and 67 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-6, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Youn (US Patent No. 5,856,816); claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada (US Patent No. 5,394,166); and claims 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 22-26, 29-43 and 47-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Youn. Claim 2 is canceled. Thus, the rejection of claim 2 is moot. However, the rejections are respectfully traversed as applied to the remaining claims.

In particular, neither Youn or Shimada, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an electro-optical device, including at least a data line driving circuit connected to data lines and capable of driving all of the data lines, and an auxiliary data line driving circuit selectively connected to a portion of all of the data lines and capable of driving the portion of all of the data lines independently from the data line driving circuit, the portion of the data lines being connected to both of the data line driving circuit and the auxiliary data line driving circuit, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 20, 39 and 40.

Moreover, neither Youn or Shimada, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an electro-optical device, including at least an auxiliary data line driving circuit

capable of driving the data lines independently from the data line driving circuit, a number of grayscale levels displayed by using the auxiliary data line driving circuit being smaller than those of the data line driving circuit, as recited in independent claim 68.

Specifically, Youn discloses in Figure 2 a liquid crystal display having a double-driver (2a, 2b). As shown in Fig. 2, one data driver 2a is connected to data lines with odd numbers (D1, D3, ..., D2n-1) and another data driver 2b is connected to data lines with even numbers (D2, D4, ..., D2n). However, neither driver is connected to all of the data lines.

Shimada discloses in Fig. 3 that a first data driver 13 is connected to data lines 1-80 and that a second data driver 14 is connected to data lines 81-160. Moreover, a third data driver 15 is connected to data lines 161-240 and a fourth data driver 16 is connected to data lines 241-320. Shimada also discloses in Fig. 9 that the supply of the display data via the data driver 92 is changed from the full use of terminals 1-320 to that of terminals 1-160 so that the reduced screen and the power saving can be accomplished. However, Shimada does not disclose an auxiliary data line driving circuit.

In contrast to the claimed invention, neither Youn or Shimada disclose or suggest a data line driving circuit connected to data lines and capable of driving all of the data lines, and an auxiliary data line driving circuit selectively connected to a portion of all of the data lines and capable of driving the portion of all of the data lines independently from the data line driving circuit, the portion of the data lines being connected to both of the data line driving circuit and the auxiliary data line driving circuit.

Moreover, neither Youn or Shimada disclose or suggest an auxiliary data line driving circuit capable of driving the data lines independently from the data line driving circuit, a number of grayscale levels displayed by using the auxiliary data line driving circuit being smaller than those of the data line driving circuit.

On the contrary, nowhere are these features disclosed or suggested. Thus, any resulting device could not have used, for example, a mode in which all dots in the display screen are used to display an image (full-dot display mode or color display mode) and a mode in which only green (G) of the display screen is emitted to display a letter or symbol (a character display mode or monochrome display mode).

Accordingly, because Youn and Shimada fail to disclose each and every feature as the claimed invention, and because it would not have been obvious to combine the applied references to arrive at the claimed invention, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-73 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Richard S. Elias
Registration No. 48,806

JAO:RSE/dap

Date: June 23, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461